

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of March 3, 2004. In response to that interview Applicant informally faxed to the Examiner a proposed amended claim which was discussed with the Examiner by telephone on April 26, 2004. As the Examiner generally remarked favorably upon the proposed amended claim, the claim amendments contained herein are consistent with that proposed amended claim.

Claims 1-14 and 16-30 were previously pending in this application. By virtue of this amendment claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 16-18, 20-22, 27-28 have been amended. No new claims have been added. As a result claims 1-14 and 16-30 are pending for examination with claims 1, 8, 16, 22, 27 and 28 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 16-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lomp (U.S. 5,799,010). Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses as follows.

During the March 3, 2004 telephone interview the Examiner requested that additional clarification be added to the claims to clarify the operation of the single instruction. Applicant has amended the independent claims to add such clarification. In particular, Applicant has amended the independent claims to specify that the operations of the single instruction are executed "in a single clock cycle of the digital signal processor."

Nowhere does Lomp disclose a single instruction performing the operations required by the claims within a single clock cycle of the digital signal processor.

As each of the independent claims, and therefore the dependent claims as well, require specified operations to be executed in response to a single instruction within a single clock cycle, the claims are therefore patentable over Lomp.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Rifaat, et al., Applicant

By: 
Ilan N. Barzilay, Reg. No. 46,540
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Telephone: (617) 720-3500

Docket No. A0312.70412US00
Date: May 12, 2004
x5/15/04